THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 October 2001

AM 10:00 **CONVENE**, Suite 312, 441 F Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes: 20 September 2001

B. Dates of next meetings: 15 November 2001
20 December 2001

C. Cancellation of the 20 December 2001 meeting due to proximity to the holidays.

D. Authority to reject incomplete applications submitted under Shipstead-Luce and Old Georgetown Acts.

E. Rescheduled lighting of the Jefferson Memorial, 23 October 2001, opening remarks at 6:15 p.m., lighting at 6:45 p.m.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 01-082, The Corcoran Gallery of Art. 500 17th Street, NW. Addition and alterations. Concept.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS continued, 18 October 2001

B. Department of the Navy

1. CFA 18/OCT/01- 1, United States Marine Corps Barracks Annex and Band Facility. 7th and L streets, SE. New building and parking structure. Concept.

2. CFA 18/OCT/01- 2, Defense Intelligence Analysis Center. Bolling Air Force Base, Luke Avenue and Chappie James Boulevard, SE. New building/addition. Concept. (Previous: CFA 8/JAN/80-3).

C. Department of the Army

1. CFA 18/OCT/01- 3, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia. Columbarium addition, Phase IV. Final design. (Previous: CFA 15/JUN/95-5).

2. CFA 18/OCT/01- 4, Fort Myer. Arlington, Virginia. Realignment of McNair Road. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 17/JUN/99-7).

D. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 18/OCT/01- 5, Smithsonian Mall Museums. Directional, program and exhibition sign system. Concept.

E. General Services Administration

CFA 18/OCT/01- 6, Federal Aviation Administration Building (FOB 10A). Independence Avenue and 7th Street, SW. Perimeters security alterations and temporary guard booths. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 16/SEP/99-5).

F. National Park Service

CFA 18/OCT/01- 7, Georgetown University Boathouse. Potomac River and Capital Crescent Trail (west of the Washington Canoe Club). New building. Concept. (See Case number O.G. 01-720).

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS continued, 18 October 2001

G. District of Columbia Public Schools / U.S. Army Corp of Engineers

1. CFA 18/OCT/01- 8, John Strong Thomson Elementary School. 12th and L streets, NW. Addition and renovation. Design development. (Previous: CFA 20/SEP/01-16).

2. CFA 18/OCT/01- 9, Noyes Elementary School. 10th and Franklin streets, NE. Addition and renovation. Concept.

H. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, continued

1. Old Georgetown Act

Appendix I.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act, continued

b. S.L. 02-001, The Portals. 1201, 1301 and 1399 Maryland Avenue, SW. Two new office buildings. Revised concept. (Previous: S.L. 01- 070, seen 19 July 2001).

c. S.L. 02-002, E Street, SW - north side (between 3rd and 4th streets) New 13-story hotel. Concept.

d. S.L. 02-003, 2807 Chesterfield Place. New single family dwelling. Concept.

e. S.L. 02-004, Station Place. F, 2nd and H streets, NE. New office building. Revised concept. (Previous: S.L. 01- 081, seen 20 Sept. 2001).

f. Appendix II.

III. INSPECTION

Freer Gallery of Art, Object proposed for acquisition.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-91 HPA. 01-191	1251 Wisconsin Avenue Lida Associates Skechers	Alterations to front and side - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** concept design for alterations to storefront as presented. Case has been on HOLD for a long period of time pending submission of supplemental drawings. File separate concept application of revised design for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-171 HPA. 01-340	3800 Reservoir Road, NW MedStar Health, Inc. Georgetown University Hospital	Sign scheme and canopies - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed entrance signs composed of free standing 12 ft. high internally-illuminated panels to replace existing sign panels on entrances 1 and 2 to the Georgetown University Hospital as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 25 September 2001. No objection to introduction of new logos for MedStar Health. Recommend retention of historic wall sign composed of individually-pin-mounted letters. No objection to recovering canopies at entrance level using blue canvas, but recommend **AGAINST** covering the metal marquees over main entrance and at garage exit stairs. File new submission of working drawings, including details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-191 * HPA. 00-395	3242 M Street, NW Georgetown BID Georgetown Visitor Center	Projecting sign - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for proposed projecting sign. Submitted materials were not sufficient for permit review. File new submission of working drawings, including sign construction and mounting details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-195 HPA. 01-400	1324 27th Street, NW Lori Trautwine Residence	Basement addition - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** concept design for proposed addition of basement under existing historic building. Recommend further study of other options.

O.G. 01-222 HPA. 01-450	1686 34th Street, NW Christine Stevens Residence	Stockade fence along sidewalk - revised design - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for either a stockade fence with a flat top or a board fence, which is preferred. Fence will be stained. Existing chain-link fence will be removed.

O.G. 01-236 HPA. 01-484	3336 P Street, NW Richard T. Clausen Residence	Porch enclosure - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and a site visit of 2 October 2001 indicate that proposed enclosure of rear porch is not visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

O.G.01-244 HPA.01-520	3328 N Street, NW Johnson and Rumph Residence	Rear additions - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed rear additions. Note: the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown holds a preservation easement on this property. File separate submission of working drawings, including construction details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-246 HPA. 01-523	3299 M Street, NW Aditi Restaurant Group Aditi Indian Restaurant	Alterations to storefront - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed alterations to storefront for the Aditi Indian Restaurant as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 15 October 2001 which indicates masonry opening aligning with windows above. File new submission of working drawings, including sign and construction details, for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-250 HPA. 01-527	3406 Q Street, NW Copper and Kanter Residence	Replacement windows - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement window sash to match original windows of this circa 1935 house as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 4 October 2001. Existing wood frames will be retained.

O.G. 01-257 HPA. 01-549	1318 33rd Street, NW Tracy Neale Residence	Replacement fence - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed Mt. Vernon flat board fence which will replace existing stockade fence.

O.G. 01-260 HPA. 01-561	3260 Prospect Street, NW Estate of Norman R. Tamarkin Cassagnol Residence	Roof deck, gates, fence and meter - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations, including roof deck above one-story portion of building, storm windows, replacement fence to match existing, swing gate for parking pad and pergola as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 15 October 2001. No objection to issuance of permit for proposed repair of metal roof on main house, and repair of original wood windows. New metal roof on rear wing and new kitchen window will match existing. Note new location of electric meter box within side yard behind brick pier where it will not be visible from public thoroughfare.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-261 HPA. 01-562	3300 M Street, NW Mark Winkler Co. Afghan Cuisine	Signs - existing permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for existing signs reading "Afghan Cuisine".

O.G. 01-262 HPA. 01-564	3206 N Street, NW Georgetown Prospect Place Neyla	Sidewalk cafe on public space - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sidewalk café on public space for Neyla, part of Prospect Place, PROVIDED the planters do not extend beyond the line of the existing projections on the adjacent property as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 16 October 2001. Recommend removal of two lampposts. Temporary sign banner should be removed no later than 30 January 2002.

O.G. 01-263 HPA. 01-565	3220 O Street, NW James Beauleau Parada Jewelers	Awning and sign - existing - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for existing awnings and signs for Parada Jewelers, which were installed without a review or permit. The vinyl covering, the design of awnings, and the size and style of lettering are not appropriate. Existing awnings and signs should be removed no later than 30 January 2002.

O.G. 01-264 HPA. 01-514	1363 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Cohen Bernstein Adonis & Venus	Signs - existing - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed signs reading "Adonis and Venus" which will match font and size of banner to be replaced as indicated in submitted materials dated 7 September 2001.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-265 HPA. 01-574	2813 Q Street, NW Paul Opelak Residence	Rear addition - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and site visit of 21 September 2001 indicate that proposed rear addition is not visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board. Replacement window screen in front facade is replacement-in-kind of previously removed screen and will match other screens elsewhere in building.

O.G. 01-266 * HPA. 01-576	3124 Q Street, NW Patrice and Herbert Miller Bowie-Sevier-Miller House Residence	Alterations to retaining wall facing P Street and iron fence - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to retaining wall facing on P Street, which will be re-built of stone, and to iron fences as shown in supplemental detail drawings received and dated 11 October 2001.

O.G. 01-267 HPA. 01-577	3124 Q Street, NW Patrice and Herbert Miller Bowie-Sevier-Miller House Residence	Alterations to gardener's cottage - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to gardener's cottage at the historic Bowie-Sevier House, as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 11 October 2001, which indicate replacement simulated-divided-light windows with 7/8" muntins to match details of windows used in the alterations to the main house.

---

* See ADDENDUM

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-268 HPA. 01-580	3142 P Street, NW Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Residence	Cupola and rear dormers on garage - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed alterations to garage, including cupola and three dormers on rear. File new submission of working drawings, including construction details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-269 HPA. 01-581	3332 O Street, NW William Davenport Residence	Alterations - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations, including new French doors on basement level, side addition and replacement windows on side elevation. No objection to issuance of permit for proposed parking pad off alley, brick garden wall, wood fence and pergola. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 01-254).

O.G. 01-271 * HPA. 01-583	3119 N Street, NW Jeff Riley Residence	2 Story rear addition - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed two-story rear addition and side porch as shown in supplemental detail drawings received and dated 16 October 2001. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 01-176).

O.G. 01-272 * HPA. 01-584	1213 34th Street, NW Gerald Schultz Residence	Roof deck - revised design - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed roof deck as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 16 October 2001. Deck railing is to be painted a dark color to limit its visibility from public thoroughfare. Working drawings conform to recommendations given during concept review. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 01-242).

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-274 HPA. 01-586	3414 Reservoir Road, NW Mr. and Mrs. Blakely Residence	Alteration for window on rear - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and site visit of 21 September 2001 indicate that proposed alteration to louver on rear for a new window is not visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

O.G. 01-275 HPA. 01-587	3314-16 M Street, NW East Banc, Inc. Waterworks	Signs - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for two proposed signs composed of 3-inch high letters reading "Waterworks" in a sign band above each of the storefronts. Proposed banner and lettering with names of cities were NOT approved and have been deleted from this submission.

O.G. 01-277 HPA. 01-590	2803 Q Street, NW Michael Stiglitz Residence	2-story rear addition and alterations to front - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for proposed 2-story rear addition and alterations to front. Submitted materials were insufficient for permit review. File new submission of working drawings, including window and construction details, and a site plan indicating existing conditions in adjoining property, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-281 HPA. 01-595	1406 30th Street, NW John Chadwick Residence	Addition of rear dormer - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition of rear dormer. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 01-115).

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-282 HPA. n/a	3800 Reservoir Road, NW MedStar Health D/B/A Georgetown University Hospital	Alterations - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and site visit of 21 September 2001 indicate that proposed alterations for new equipment at the Gorman Building is not visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

O.G. 01-283 HPA. 01-596	3407 N Street, NW Mr. and Mrs. Haws Residence	Rear in-fill addition - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and site visit of 21 September 2001 indicate that proposed rear in-fill addition is not visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

O.G. 02-01 HPA. 02-02	1500 35th Street, NW Georgetown Visitation Monastery	Roof vents - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and a site visit of 11 October 2001 indicate that new roof vents are proposed for a location where they will not be visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

O.G. 02-03 HPA. 02-05	1077 30th Street, NW James Place Condominium Assoc. Residential	Waterproofing and replacement brick pavers on public space - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed work in public space, currently in progress, including replacement of sidewalk brick pavers in a pattern to match existing, and repair of brick planter and concrete driveway. Proposed work is repair work in coordination with maintenance waterproofing work and will match original conditions. See recommendations for alterations to planter under separate case (O.G. 02-04).

ADDENDUM

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-191 HPA. 00-395	3242 M Street, NW Georgetown BID Georgetown Visitor Center	Projecting sign - permit

STATUS: On HOLD until Old Georgetown Board meeting 1 November 2001 for further review at the written request of applicant.

O.G. 01-266 HPA. 01-576	3124 Q Street, NW Patrice and Herbert Miller Bowie-Sevier-Miller House Residence	Alterations to retaining wall facing P Street and iron fence - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to retaining wall facing on P Street, which will be re-built of stone, and to iron gate and fence as shown in supplemental detail drawings received and dated 23 October 2001, PROVIDED iron fence is no taller than 6'-0" as indicated in application.

O.G. 01-271 HPA. 01-583	3119 N Street, NW Jeff Riley Residence	2 Story rear addition - permit

STATUS: On HOLD until Old Georgetown Board meeting 1 November 2001 for further review at the written request of applicant.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-272 HPA. 01-584	1213 34th Street, NW Gerald Schultz Residence	Roof deck - revised design - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed roof deck as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 16 October 2001. Deck railing is to be painted a dark color to limit its visibility from public thoroughfare. Working drawings conform to recommendations given during concept review. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 01-242). Note is made that project is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 01-088	2813 Bellevue Terrace, NW Carter Cusick Residence	Third-floor additions and roof deck - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Property is outside the Shipstead-Luce Act Jurisdiction of the Commission of Fine Arts. (Returned to Permit Processing Division, 23 October 2001.)

S.L. 01-089 HPA. 01-594	1925 Park Road, NW J. Dwyer Residence	Replacement attic windows - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for replacement attic windows, provided replacement units are true-divided, 15-light (5 wide and 3 high), wood sashes that replicate originals, as shown in materials received and dated 9 October 2001.

S.L. 01-090 HPA. 01-589	245 Second Street, NE Friends Committee on National Legislation Education Fund	Renovations and additions - Concept

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed renovation and addition as shown in drawings received and dated 5 October 2001. File new submission of working drawings with permit application, for review by the Commission when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 01-091 HPA. 01-599	2041 Park Road, NW Roddy-Johnson Residence	Alteration to porch and replacement window and door - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for alterations to existing front porch, including replacement of first floor window and door as shown in drawings received and dated 4 October 2001.

S.L. 02-005	400 North Capitol Street, NW MedBar Fund	Roof top dish antenna - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for roof top dish antenna as shown in drawings received and dated 10 October 2001. Suggest using smaller antenna or locating antenna at the northwestern side of the roof so that it is not visible from the Capitol grounds. File new submission of working drawings with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS PRE-MEETING TOUR

18 October 2001

Convene: 8:00 a.m., National Building Museum, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

Site for addition to the Corcoran Gallery of Art, New York Avenue, N.W., between 17th and 18th streets.

Members present:
J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Harry G. Robinson III, Vice-Chairman
Carolyn Brody
Donald A. Capoccia
Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel
Pamela Nelson
Eden Rafshoon

Staff present:
Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Frederick J. Lindstrom, Acting Assistant Secretary
Sue Kohler
José Martínez-Canino
Susan Raposa

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 October 2001

The meeting was convened at 10:02 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices in the National Building Museum, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, after a tour of project sites.

Members present:
Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Hon. Harry G. Robinson III, Vice-Chairman
Hon. Carolyn Brody
Hon. Donald A. Capoccia
Hon. Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel
Hon. Pamela Nelson
Hon. Eden Rafshoon

Staff present:
Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Mr. Frederick J. Lindstrom, Assistant Secretary
Ms. Sue Kohler
Mr. José Martínez-Canino
Ms. Susan Raposa

National Capital Planning Commission staff present:
Mr. David Hamilton

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of the minutes of the 20 September meeting. The minutes were approved without objection.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as:

15 November
20 December

C. Cancellation of the 20 December meeting due to proximity to the holidays. It was agreed that the meeting would be canceled, with the stipulation that the members would keep the date on their calendars in case it was needed.

D. Authority to reject incomplete applications submitted under Shipstead-Luce and Old Georgetown acts. The Secretary noted that the staff was receiving an increasing number of

applications that were not complete enough to be understood by them or by the Old Georgetown Board, and the applicants often challenged the staff's right to reject them. He said the authority had been delegated at some time in the past, but he would like to have it reaffirmed by the Commission now in order to strengthen the staff's hand in the matter. There were no objections, and the staff was unanimously given the authority to reject any application it considered incomplete.

E. Rescheduled lighting of the Jefferson Memorial, 23 October; opening remarks at 6:15 p.m., lighting at 6:45 p.m. The Secretary reported the rescheduling and urged attendance by anyone who could make it; the Chairman noted that the lighting had gotten better and better, thanks to several chilly evenings spent at the site by Commission members.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 01-082, The Corcoran Gallery of Art, 500 17th Street, N.W. Addition and alterations. Concept. The Secretary observed that this was the first submission of a design for this project, noting that the Commission had not seen the competition-winning design by Mr. Gehry. He asked David Levy, director of the Corcoran, to begin the presentation. The transcript of Mr. Levy's remarks and those of architect Frank Gehry, which followed, as well as the discussion with members of the Commission, is attached to these minutes as Exhibit A. The concept design was unanimously approved, with the request for further study of some elements, particularly those involving security. Exhibits A-1 and J

B. Department of the Navy

1. CFA 18/OCT/01-1, United States Marine Corps Barracks Annex and Band Facility, 7th and L streets, S.E. New building and parking structure. Concept. The Assistant Secretary introduced this project as a dual purpose facility: an annex to add more living quarters for the Marines and also a band facility to be used for rehearsals and recording, and for storage purposes. Using an aerial photograph, he pointed out the location, noting that it was across the Southwest Freeway from the historic Marine Barracks on 8th Street on a site formerly occupied by public housing. He introduced Gene Washington from the Navy who in turn introduced the architect, Mark Boekenheide from Brennan Beer Gorman Monk.

Mr. Boekenheide described the site, bounded by Virginia Avenue, L Street, 5th Street, and 7th Street, as existing within a varied context–high-rise, middle-rise, and low-rise residential structures, designed in a variety of styles and predominantly brick. He said there were several constraints on the site, including a Department of Defense force protection setback of 80 feet from the streets, view corridors along K Street and 6th Street that had to be respected, and a requirement for recreation fields of a certain size and dimension; additionally, there was a 25-foot grade change across the site.

He said there were four major pieces in the program–a recreation field, a parking garage for 273 cars, the band facility, and the BEQ, enlisted men's quarters, with 167 units. The four-story parking garage had been located where it would not interfere with the view corridors and would satisfy

security requirements that it be separated from the other components, which had then been fitted into the rest of the site. The two main pieces, the band facility and the dormitory, had been designed as one building, but with a difference in scale and architectural treatment that would reflect their different uses. He showed drawings, noting the long facade of the BEQ and how they had attempted to break it up; he also pointed out the pedestrian arcade on two sides of the building. The Chairman asked if the arcade could be a little higher so that it would not be dark inside, and he also noted that the 200-foot long facade really needed to be broken up more than it was, perhaps by pavilions at both ends or one in the center; there was a discussion with Ms. Diamonstein and Vice-Chairman Robinson of ways to accomplish this differentiation in the facade. Mr. Boekenheide pointed out other features of the building, the way the two parts had been separated and differentiated, and the tower element between them that acted as a focal point. The Chairman noted that the columned opening for the entrance at the southeast corner looked as though the brick wall above was not supported; he suggested adding a lintel. Mr. Boekenheide then turned to the security aspects of the project, noting that there would be a security fence around the entire project, with the exception of the playing fields, which would be open to the neighbors. There would also be a secured vehicular entrance, as well as security zones within the structure. Noting that the drawings showed no landscaping, he said they nevertheless did have a landscape plan which included a series of trees and other plantings, as well as ground cover and ivy. Questions were asked about materials, and Mr. Boekenheide said the principal material would be brick, with a band of stucco running around the top floor for contrast in color and differentiation in the facades. Mrs. Brody and the other members were concerned that the brick sample looked "brown and mousy", but Mr. Boekenheide said he thought that was because of the color grout used; in any case, he said they were still investigating colors.

The parking garage was discussed next. He said the presence of the view corridors made it impossible to design an efficient garage, which required the ability to work with multiples of 60 feet; since they could not do this, they had to increase the height to four stories. He said they had proposed an alternate design that would be efficient and would also allow one face to be pulled back 30 feet, but it would extend somewhat into these view corridors. He said there had been no definite decision by the Planning Commission as to whether this would be acceptable. The Assistant Secretary said the staff did not think the 6th Street view corridor was that important in this location. Although it was seen as worth preserving because it was part of the L'Enfant Plan (intended to be the site of a public market), he noted that 6th Street had ceased to exist in some blocks in the area, and just to the north of the site was blocked by the freeway. He said that, in any case, some open space there would have to be preserved because of the presence of a large storm sewer running through the site, and he noted that the request for building within the viewshed amounted to only about 12-15 feet. The Chairman thought the trade-offs would be worth the narrowed view, commenting that sometimes a narrowed view was preferable because it provided more focus; there was a general agreement among the members that this was true.

The Chairman then asked the architect to discuss the design of the garage. Mr. Boekenheide showed drawings, saying that the spandrels would be precast concrete and the vertical piers brick; there would be a simple tower element in the middle to house the elevators and stairs. Mr. Capoccia suggested that the stucco used on the main building might be repeated here, on the spandrels. The Chairman cautioned against using a color that would offer too much contrast to the brick. He also suggested some kind of screening to avoid a full view of the parked cars, perhaps with the addition of vines or other plant material. The Assistant Secretary suggested looking at the garages at Arlington National Cemetery and at Reagan National Airport. The concept design was then unanimously approved. Exhibit B

2. CFA 18/OCT/01-2, Defense Intelligence Analysis Center, Bolling Air Force Base, Luke Avenue and Chappie James Boulevard, S.E. New building/addition. Concept. (Previous CFA 8/JAN/80-3) The Assistant Secretary said this submission was for an addition to the Defense Intelligence Analysis Center, but in effect, it was a new and large building attached to the Center. Even though it would be an Air Force facility, it was being submitted by the Navy, which was acting as the Architect/Engineer. Mr. Lindstrom pointed out the site on an aerial photo and then introduced Gene Washington from the Navy and architect David King from the Smith Group; he asked Mr. King to make the presentation.

Mr. King first introduced Admiral James Mazzelman from the DIA to give the members some background information. He said that since the existing building was built in the early 1980s there had been many changes in the agency as well as an increase in personnel, many of whom were now working in typical urban office space off the base. He said this space was not really satisfactory because of the high-tech equipment used and the need for back-up power and security, and so they had opted for a new building on the base that would provide space and protection for their increased workforce.

Mr. King then discussed the site and the constraints on it, as well as the existing building and the views of it from various vantage points. He described the building, as high as seven stories in some places, as being made up of nine square "pods", each sheathed in light-colored metal panels with a ribbon window type of fenestration. He said it was visible from a number of locations and was especially noticeable from the air. Because the view of it from the monumental core was to its north facade, they had ruled out any addition on that side and had settled on the south as the site for the addition. Besides the viewsheds, other constraints included helicopter approaches and pads, sewer lines and utilities, and historic buildings on the base.

Mr. King showed a site plan with the two buildings, describing the proposed addition as a long, thin, rectangular structure, completely flexible, with open space on both faces and core facilities to the north; it was placed at an angle to the existing building. The north facade would be fairly similar to that building and would act as a backdrop; the south face would become in essence the doorway to the whole complex and would be almost entirely glass. As the main entrance to the old building was on the south side, this worked out very nicely. The berms that were part of the security element of the existing building would be continued and redefined around the addition. There would also be other kinds of security devices in and around the building. Mr. King described the way the two buildings would meet, the continuation of the fundamental north-south organization, and the circulation pattern.

There were no questions for Mr. King; the members all thought he had arrived at an admirable solution for an addition to the existing building, and the concept design was unanimously approved. Exhibit C

C. Department of the Army

1. CFA 18/OCT/01-3, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia. Columbarium addition, Phase IV. Final design. (Previous: CFA 15/JUN/95-5) The Chairman noted for the benefit of the new members that the Commission had approved the columbarium design from the beginning and had been enthusiastic about its simplicity, dignity, and appropriateness; he said he did not see that the presentation would be a lengthy one. Mr. Martínez then introduced Virgle Coleman from Arlington Cemetery.

Mr. Coleman said Phase IV would be larger than the previous phases and would include a north and south columbarium and a ceremonial plaza; the materials would be the same as for the

preceding phases. Mr. Martinez showed a model of the original master plan when it was presented in the 1980s, explaining the subsequent changes in the layout of the columbarium units and the plazas. There were no objections, and Phase IV was unanimously approved. Exhibit D

2. CFA 18/OCT/01-4, Fort Myer, Arlington, Virginia. Realignment of McNair Road. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 17/JUN/99-7) Mr. Martínez recalled that the Commission had seen this project before, as part of a package that included proposed alterations to the forecourt of the chapel. He said the forecourt alterations had been dropped for the time being and only the realignment of the road was going ahead. He introduced Greg Post from Fort Myer.

Mr. Post described the existing cumbersome traffic pattern that had to be followed in order to get to the parking area for attendance at funerals and then showed the new realignment plan. The Vice-Chairman, who was familiar with the situation, thought it would be a great improvement and would begin to create a place in front of the chapel, which it really needed All agreed, and the realignment was unanimously approved. Exhibit E

D. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 18/OCT/01-5, Smithsonian Mall museums. Directional, program and exhibition sign system. Concept. The Assistant Secretary introduced Harry Rombach from the Smithsonian to begin the presentation. Mr. Rombach commented on the proliferation of signs in Washington and admitted that the Smithsonian had done its share in adding to the clutter. He said that during a meeting to discuss signs for the Museum of American History it had been proposed that the Smithsonian address all their signs, at least those on the Mall, and then perhaps later, those in other parts of the city. The goal was not only to cut down on the number, but also the multiple designs and styles. The design firm of MFN was hired, and Mr. Rombach said the Smithsonian was pleased with what they had done. He introduced Beth Miles and Dave Friedberg from that firm and asked Ms. Niles to discuss their proposals.

Ms. Miles said this was still a concept, but it would establish the number and type of signs to be included in the program. She said the goal was to identify clearly which buildings on the Mall were part of the Smithsonian, adding that when the American Indian Museum was completed, there would be eleven. She noted that architecturally they were very diverse, and people often came up to them when they were out photographing and asked, "Which building is the Smithsonian?" She hoped they could establish a unified format for each museum to present posters, exhibition announcements, events, etc., that was consistent Mall-wide. She said the portable brown kiosks now existing would be removed.

Ms. Miles said there would be three kinds of signs: museum program signs, building identification signs, and museum information signs. The museum program signs would appear only in the block where the museum was located; they would be permanent structures on the sidewalks, two-sided, glass-fronted, with frequently changing exhibition and event information presented in a standard format. The Smithsonian sunburst logo would always appear, as a unifying element. They would be 8 and 1/2 feet tall and just under 4 feet wide, and they would not be illuminated. The frame would be bronze, and the base granite. The museum information signs would post hours, closings, etc. and contain a map; they would be placed at major intersections. They would not be changed frequently–only about twice a year–and the signboard itself would probably be made of an acrylic material. The frames would be bronze, similar to the program signs, but they would be four-sided, giving the opportunity to present Smithsonian-wide events on the narrow sides; height and width would

be the same as the program signs, but they would be about 16 inches deep. The building information signs would be bronze, in a horizontal format, scaled to their location, and placed on existing architectural stonework or on granite bases, like the other signs.

The members had a number of questions for Ms. Miles concerning the number of signs, placement, background color, and the proposed material for the museum information signs. Mr. Capoccia asked if the museums would still be allowed to put up banners. Mr. Rombach said banners were not addressed in this program, and they were still an issue. Mr. Capoccia commented that it seemed that the Smithsonian was trying to impose a rational signage system for the Mall, but they were doing it on top of what was really an irrational "advertising" system.

After a long discussion, the consensus was that the Commission commended the endeavor to clean up the visual clutter while still providing needed information, but needed more answers based on the questions asked, and a better idea of the extent of the existing signs and banners, including those erected by the Downtown Business Incentive District (BID) and the National Park Service. The concept design for the individual sign units was approved. Exhibit F

E. National Park Service

CFA 18/OCT/01-6, Georgetown University Boathouse, Potomac River and the Capital Crescent Trail (upstream of the Washington Canoe Club). New building, concept design. (See case number O.G. 01-720) Mr. Martínez said the Park Service was presenting this project in coordination with Georgetown University, as it involved a land swap between the two parties which would allow the university to build its boathouse on this site. He said the Georgetown Board had reviewed the project at its October meeting and enthusiastically approved the concept design. He noted the presence of John Parsons from the Park Service, representatives from the university, and the architect, Stephen Muse.

The Chairman commented to Mr. Parsons and the other presenters that the Commission had an especially long agenda, and as the members had seen the drawings for the boathouse, and if they shared his enthusiasm for the design in principle, perhaps the introductory remarks could be dispensed with and the architect could proceed immediately with his discussion of the design. The members agreed to this, but Mr. Parsons asked to say a few words for the benefit of the new members about the creation of the Georgetown Waterfront Park, downstream from Key Bridge, made possible by a transfer of an asphalt parking lot from the District of Columbia to the Park Service. As part of the park plan, a boathouse zone had been established, extending 1,000feet upstream from Key Bridge to align with the towers of Georgetown University. As the Park Service could not give the boathouse site to the university, they planned to enter into a land transfer, involving a piece of land further upstream owned by the university. He said they had not yet received zoning approval for the project, preferring to get approval from this Commission and NCPC first.

After a brief statement by the university's staff architect, Alan Brangman, architect Stephen Muse was introduced. Mr. Muse noted first that he was dealing with a long, thin site–120 feet by 400 feet–because of the presence of the bike path and a steep slope at the rear. He had, therefore, placed the main body of the building in the center, flanked by a wing on each side. At ground level there would be two boat bays in the upstream wing and three in the central building, with a rowing tank in the downstream wing; the usual boathouse facilities would be placed on the upper floor. The exterior resembled the adjacent Washington Canoe Club structure and other picturesque late 19th-century boathouses. Mr. Muse said he anticipated the lower level would be fieldstone and the upper either

wood shingle or slate shingle. Shutters would be a very deep blue, with the same color being used on the boat bays. The concept design was received enthusiastically and unanimously approved. Exhibit G

F. District of Columbia Public Schools/U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

1. CFA 18/OCT/01-7, John Strong Thomson Elementary School, 12th and L streets, N.W. Addition and renovation. Design development. (Previous: CFA 20/SEP/01-16) The Assistant Secretary said this submission was in response to the Commission's request to restudy the 12th Street facade of the new addition. He introduced architect Louis Fry III of Lance Bailey Associates.

Mr. Fry recalled that the Commission's concern all along had been the treatment of the required open-air play spaces as they faced 12th Street adjacent to the historic school, and the avoidance of the appearance of a cage for children. He showed his new design, which resembled the old building in the pattern and shape of the openings and in the gable roof form which crowned the central element. This was to be plastered concrete with large openings divided into squares by tubular steel; grillage filled the lower row of squares and continued up the sides, with the center area squares covered with a fine mesh. The central element was flanked by brick "wings"with smaller window-like openings, using the same grillage and mesh; Mr. Fry said the brick would not be the same color as the old school, but would be in the same family. He noted that there would also be some play space out in the open on the roof. The Vice-Chairman thought the project had come a long way; the Chairman and the other members agreed, and the design development was unanimously approved. Exhibit H

2. CFA 18/OCT/01-8, Noyes Elementary School, 10th and Franklin streets, N.E.. Addition and renovation. Concept. The Assistant Secretary located this school, about two blocks northwest of the Rhode Island Metro station, in a pleasant, low-scale neighborhood. He said when the staff first saw this design it was already at the 90 percent completion stage. There were some concerns with the site plan as well as the elevations and the relationship to the old school, so in the interest of moving the project along and not holding up the D.C. Public Schools' schedule, suggestions had been made as to how the design might be improved. Mr. Lindstrom showed the plans the staff had seen, noting some rather large and unsympathetic additions that were being proposed. He also showed existing conditions, noting a 1940s auditorium that would be kept, because if it were demolished, they would not have the ability to build another one. He pointed out other nondescript brick buildings on the site that would be demolished, and noted also that the play areas were all out on the corner of the street, in a sea of asphalt. Parking and utility areas were all behind the school building. He said the architect's current plan was to renovate the existing school, keep the auditorium, add a two-story gymnasium and dining room addition behind the auditorium, and classroom space in a one-story wing attached to the historic school. He introduced architect Wayne Scott from McKissack and McKissack to describe the plans in more detail.

Mr. Scott said the two-story addition would pick up on detailing on the auditorium building, and the classroom addition would be more related to the historic building in its architectural style. The old building would be devoted to administrative space on the ground floor with classroom space on the upper floor. He noted that the classroom addition would now have windows more related to the historic building than it had in the earlier plans, which had taken a more modernistic approach, and that it was separated somewhat from the old building to give it more breathing space. Mr. Scott then discussed changes on the site, including the location of bus and car drop-off points, the moving of the

parking area to a spot that was deemed safer for the staff, and the change in location of the play areas to more attractive positions within the complex.

The members had some questions for Mr. Scott about the detailing of certain elements, which he said he would look into. Mr. Lindstrom reminded the Commission that Mr. Scott had had only a very few days in which to prepare these new plans, and he would have things worked out more fully for the next submission. Ms. Diamonstein thought the goal should be to provide additions sympathetic to the historic building when developing the design, and she thought Mr. Scott should continue to work with the staff. The Chairman observed that while the two-story addition could bear some resemblance to the auditorium, the design was not so great that it had to be uppermost in mind when it came to details; he thought the new building could be more graceful and inspiring, that the architect should try to have a little fun with it. Mr. Scott thanked the Commission for the suggestions, and said he would be back with a more fully developed design. Exhibit I

G. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (continued from "A")

1. Old Georgetown Act

Appendix I. The Appendix was approved without objection.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act (continued from "A")

b. S.L. 02-001, The Portals, 1201, 1301, and 1399 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Two new office buildings, revised concept. (Previous: S.L. 01-070, seen 19 July 2001) The Assistant Secretary recalled the previous submission, when the architect, Arthur Cotton Moore, had proposed three new buildings; at that time the Commission had been concerned about the height, requesting that he lower it to the 90-foot cornice line mandated in the original master plan for the project. Mr. Lindstrom said the revised concept showed only two buildings at the north, which had been lowered two floors but were still not quite as low as the original buildings; however, the new building to the west had been raised somewhat, and there was some concern about that because of the view from the Jefferson Memorial. He introduced Mr. Moore to discuss his revisions, and he noted the presence of a large model in the room

Using the model, Mr. Moore pointed to the north building, which was 26 feet lower than the two buildings connected by a galleria that had originally been proposed; the galleria had been removed. He said the actual height increase now was only 14 feet, and as he had introduced a cornice line at 90 feet and a setback above that, he thought the modest increase in height was reasonable and would allow the developer to compete in a market that demanded 9-foot ceilings. The total height would be 104 feet. Mr. Moore pointed out that the buildings in the surrounding area were all higher; he commented especially on the approved revisions to the Blue Cross building, which were allowed to go to 160 feet. Turning to the proposed building at the western edge of the site, Mr. Moore said that while it was one floor higher than before, bringing it to 104 feet, the same as the north building, it was set in a depression, and the street on which it faced, called Maiden Lane, was so low it was connected with a tunnel that ran under 14th Street. He noted also a series of major trees and other elements that would tend to obscure the building, and he thought that only the top part of his building and the yet-to-be-built Mandarin Hotel on the Portals site would be visible. From the north the 172-foot high printing plant would prevent the complex from being seen from Independence Avenue.

The members got up to view the model and discuss the added cornice line at the 90-foot level and the depth of the setback above it. The Vice-Chairman thought the project had come a long way and that Mr. Moore had addressed the Commission's concerns; the Chairman and the other members agreed. There were no more questions for Mr. Moore, and the concept design was unanimously approved. Exhibit J

c. S.L. 02-002, E. Street, S.W., north side (between 3rd and 4th streets). New 13-story hotel. Concept. Mr. Martínez described the location, near the Design Center and the raised railroad tracks, and said a parking garage building in this block was to be demolished and three buildings would be built on the site; the hotel would be the middle building. It would be built for the Marriott Corporation, and the architect was Mark Boekenheide from BBGM, whom the Commission had seen earlier in the day as the architect for the Marine Corps Barracks annex. He introduced Mr. Boekenheide to discuss his design.

Mr. Boekenheide said this would be a limited service hotel; that is, it would not have a lot of meeting rooms but would consist mostly of guest rooms and food service primarily for its guests. He described the site, which he said was both physically and visually impacted by the raised (20 feet) railroad tracks at the rear. In addition to the Design Center, other buildings in the area included a Pepco substation, the headquarters for NASA, and several typical office buildings with ribbon windows. He said the hotel would be thirteen stories tall and have about 240 rooms. To get as many rooms as possible and provide adequate light for this middle-of-the-block site, the building had been designed in a T-shape; loading dock and parking entrances would be from E Street, but the actual loading docks would be underneath the building, not on the street. The building line would be set back where these entrances occurred to make them less noticeable and to break up the facade. Next to the recessed area would be a slot of balconies going from the third to the thirteenth floor, again, to add variety and break up the facade. All the facades, except the two end walls, would be brick; the end walls, which would eventually have other buildings built up against them, would be parged block with score lines and color to tie in with the brick. The brick and the punched, double-hung windows were intended to give a more residential look to the building, as was the landscaping in the front. Colors had not been chosen, but Mr. Boekenheide said there would be a contrasting color brick around the windows and also accent bands of brick and some prairie stone used on the base to add interest. There were no objections to the plans as presented, and the concept design was unanimously approved. Exhibit J

d. S.L.02-003, 2807 Chesterfield Place. New single family dwelling. Concept. The Assistant Secretary commented that the Commission had reviewed several houses in this area, including architect Travis Price's own house and most recently the Rabinowitz-Fischman house. Now Mr. Price was submitting a design for a speculative development house for his neighbor, William Wahabi. He was introduced to discuss his design.

Mr. Price talked about the various styles in the neighborhood and said he wanted to design something that would fit in with them all. He had decided to go with a design that was reminiscent of Frank Lloyd Wright's prairie school houses, one that would hug the ground and adapt to the steep slope on the site. He showed a massing model, noting the terracing and the balconies, and the siting of the house near the street and away from the streambed. He noted that most of the trees had been removed by the previous owner who then decided not to build, but he would do everything he could to be sure the remaining ones would survive. He said the lot coverage would be minimal, and there would be lots of light. A glass enclosed stair and the orientation of the rooms would provide ample

views of the park. Dark brick, wood, and copper would reinforce the woodland feeling and carry out the prairie house feeling.

The Chairman asked if anyone from the community wanted to comment. ANC Commissioner Robert Maudlin was the first to speak. He said the ANC had three requests: (1) Make the house smaller to ensure that the remaining trees would be given every chance to survive. (2) Provide more than one off-street parking space so that other cars belonging to the owner or guests would not be parked on Chesterfield Street. (3) Be sure important trees were saved by changing the design where the trees came too close to the house. Neighbor Peter Halle spoke next. He said he was also speaking for the Forest Hills Citizens Association and wanted to reiterate what Mr. Maudlin had said, especially about the trees. The Chairman questioned whether reducing the size from 6,000 to perhaps 4,000 square feet would really help the tree problem, and it seemed an undue hardship to ask for this when the 6,000 square feet represented only about half what the owner was allowed. He said he had no problem with the design or the scale, and he asked the other members for their thoughts. Mr. Capoccia said he wasn't sure that even a 4,000 square foot house could be built if it was necessary to guarantee the survival of the trees. Ms. Diamonstein said she assumed that Mr. Price had researched the extent to which the topography would be disturbed and was satisfied that it would not be excessive; he agreed that was the case. She also asked if there were any problems in regard to the bulk and height, and Mr. Price said there were none, that they were at about half the size of the maximum allowed. In regard to the parking, which was her next question, he said he thought he could mange to provide one more parking site, to the side, in a way that would make it look like part of the landscape.

There were no other questions or comments. Ms. Diamonstein made a motion that the concept design be approved subject to solving the parking problem; it was seconded by the Vice-Chairman and carried unanimously. Exhibit J

e. S.L. 02-004, Station Place, F, 2nd and H streets, N.E. New office building, revised concept. (Previous: S.L. 01-081, seen 20 September) Before introducing this project, the Assistant Secretary gave the Commission some figures comparing the size of the U.S. Capitol with Station Place: North-south length of the Capitol, 751 feet; of Station Place, 933 feet; width of the Capitol at its widest point, 350 feet; of Station Place on the F Street facade, 325 feet; ground floor area of the Capitol, 4 acres; of Station Place, about 3.5 acres; floor plate area for the Capitol with four floors and one basement/terrace level, 16.5 acres; for Station Place on ten levels with three levels below-ground parking, 31.7 acres. Mr. Lindstrom then introduced architect Kevin Roche to make his slide presentation and answer questions.

Mr. Roche listed the issues raised by both the Commission of Fine Arts, the District's Office of Planning, and the community and gave his answer to each. The first one concerned the 64-foot setback requested by the community. Mr. Roche said if he did that, there would have to be a solid wall running all along 2nd Street, and even then they would lose 115,000 square feet of the allowable bulk, and they were already below the 6 FAR allowed. Also, the interior space would be such that it would be totally impractical for an office building. As for the Architect of the Capitol's master plan, he said that setback requirement did not apply to this site.

The second issue raised concerned excess height and bulk. To address this he presented three new schemes, each with different ways of reducing these items. Scheme 1 was similar to what he presented the last time, except that the tenth floor was set back another 20 feet to reduce the visibility from H Street. Scheme 2 would set back the south end 30 feet further than before and would still retain the setback on the north end. Scheme 3 would eliminate the tenth floor on the first building. In each scheme the penthouse had been reduced from 18 to 11 feet. Mr. Roche said each scheme

would have an impact on the planning of the interior, particularly on the F Street entrance and the proposed atrium space inside. This brought him to the third issue raised previously: the design of this entrance. The Commission was not happy with the one he presented in September and preferred an earlier version which was based on a concave curve. He said they could do this with schemes 1 and 2 but not with Scheme 3 which would require using the atrium to regain office space lost by eliminating the tenth floor .

The next issue was the monumental presence on 2nd Street, across from the small houses at the beginning of a residential neighborhood He showed the earlier scheme with a series of glass wings and courtyards in between, and a two-story granite arcade , planted with vines, that ran the length of the facade. The new proposal kept this intact for the first building, but Building 2 would have a granite facade and vertical separations to set it apart from Building 1. Some of the landscaped arcade would be put back on buildings 3 and 4, and minor changes had been made to the design of the buildings. The center portion of Building 2 had been set 20 feet further back and a public space created; he showed slides of renderings of the courtyards and the newly-created public space, noting an additional line of trees, more street furniture, fountains, and additional planting. He also showed a view of the south end (F Street), which retained the landscaped granite arcade, and noted the relationship in height to the Judiciary Building on the opposite side of the street.

Another issue was the H Street facade and the way it seemed to ignore the proposed development for that street. The new design showed an entrance here and an atrium, so that there would be a way to access H Street from the north end of the building. The facade had been changed from glass to granite. Lastly, the west facade had been made more interesting by the addition of some projections, even though it would face a 67-foot-wide alley when the building on the opposite side was built.

Ms. Diamonstein asked if there was a timetable for the construction of the buildings following Building 1, which she assumed would be built first. Bob Braunohler, from Louis Dreyfus, the developers, said they planned to build the other buildings as soon as they could find tenants; he added that Building 2 would probably be used for expansion of the SEC and possibly another tenant. The Chairman then commented that one option for the Commission would be to approve one of the schemes for buildings 1 and 2 and hold review of the other two in abeyance. Ms. Diamonstein thought it was necessary to know what the entire project was going to look like, because it would be difficult to approve part of the project if there was no commitment that it would eventually be part of a larger whole. Mr. Braunohler said it would be helpful in their marketing efforts if they could get approval for the entire project, because they would be competing with other sites for large tenants and would be at a disadvantage if they had to come back for more approvals. Mrs. Brody didn't see any reason for breaking up the approval; she thought an integrated design and development were necessary, and she would not hold back approval of the whole package for either aesthetic or business reasons.

Mr. Capoccia asked about the Chairman's question, at the last meeting, about the legality of choosing the datum for measuring the height from H Street, and how that had been addressed. Steve Sherwood, from the firm of Holland and Knight, said the height could be measured either from F Street or from H Street, and they were still within the limits of the law and the regulations

Ms. Diamonstein said that of the three schemes, she preferred Scheme 2 with the two setbacks; Ms. Nelson and Mrs. Brody agreed, with Mrs. Brody adding that she also like Scheme 3 but did not want to give up the atrium. The Chairman thought a lot of improvements had been made, but he observed that buildings 3 and 4 seemed to "run out of steam" and would be helped by a further breaking up of the mass. Mrs. Brody commented that a major entrance at that end of the complex would help, and that might come when the user was known.

The Chairman then asked for comments from the community. Mr. Lindstrom first passed out three letters that had been received in support and one against the project, and then, before the community was heard, asked George Brown from the SEC to make a statement. Mr. Brown referred to a letter sent to the Commission in support, saying that there had been a competition for the design, and of the eight proposals, this was the best. Of the three schemes presented at this meeting, the SEC preferred Scheme 1, followed by 2, and lastly, 3. They concurred with the Commission that the original entrance and lobby design was the best. He said their lease on their current space would expire on 31 December 2003; they had been assured that the project could be finished by that date, but he wanted the Commission to know that it would be a tight schedule. The Chairman said that was the reason he wanted to approve buildings 1 and 2 now, so the SEC's space wouldn't be held up.

The first person to speak from the community was Nancy Metzger, who had spoken at the previous meetings. She again focused on the interface of this project with the Capitol Hill neighborhood, stressing the importance of 2nd Street as a transition street, where the height should step back towards the smaller neighborhood scale. She said both the District's Comprehensive Plan and the Architect of the Capitol's Master Plan were specific about this, and she differed with Mr. Roche as to the areas covered by the 64-foot setback requirement. While she agreed the additional setback for Building 2 was a help, she pointed out that for most of the length of the project on 2nd Street, people would be walking only 2 feet away from the office windows–not a good thing as far as the SEC's security was concerned and not far enough to give the neighborhood any breathing space. She thought if only a small section of the project was going to be set back, it should be in front of the 2nd and F Street building, where it would be most visible, especially from Massachusetts Avenue.

David Ball, president of the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, was the next speaker. He commented that having worked at Union Station for seventeen years he was quite familiar with the neighborhood, and it was interesting to look at the project from both perspectives. He said he thought that, generically, the project was a good one that should go ahead. He commented that his organization had been working with the developer in terms of providing access from Union Station into the SEC building, and he added that they would be coming back to the Commission in the near future with plans for improvements to Columbus Plaza and a possible expansion of the parking garage.

Keith Jarrell, the ANC commissioner from the area, said he represented 2000 people in his district, not just the immediate neighbors of the project, and he thought the project would bring many advantages to a neighborhood that had been in ruins since the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. and was just now on the verge of a renaissance. He thought anything would be an improvement over the existing parking lot, and although the building might not blend well architecturally with some of the buildings around it, there was no reason why it should, and he thought it would actually add "a good deal of class and character".

Evans Sealander, a property owner and manager in the neighborhood, said many property owners in the area wanted this project to go ahead and had signed the petition he had brought to the Commission. He said the neighborhood had problems with abandoned buildings, trash, and crime, and the only way he could see these problems being solved was to get this building built.

Richard Bell, president of Potomac Development Company, said he and his partner, David Schwartz, owned a number of properties in the area, from townhouses to a parking lot, and they were the developers of the Railway Express Building. He said they strongly supported the development of Station Place, and believed it was in the best interests of the neighborhood to take advantage of the willingness of the Dreyfus Property Group to invest in this project. The presence of the SEC in the building would ensure that another important government agency would stay in the District, and he saw the development as critical to the revitalization of the H Street corridor. He noted that large

government offices on 2nd Street all the way across Capitol Hill had not destroyed the residential properties they faced, and neither would this one.

Mr. Lindstrom said he had a letter from Drury Tallant, from the Stanton Park community group, which he would distribute, and then introduced Russell Sturm, the last of the speakers from the community.

Mr. Sturm, who had spoken at a previous meeting, said first that he and many others endorsed a large commercial building on the parking lot site and welcomed the SEC as a tenant. His problem, at this point, was with the revised design, which he did not think was responsive to the Commission's previous comments. He thought it was still a "beached whale", that it was still too high, that the new public area in front of Building 2 would not be visible from 2nd and F, where most of the traffic occurred, that it was still impossibly close to the street on both 2nd and F streets, and that no attempt had been made to step back from the second floor stone plinth, as the Vice-Chairman had suggested. He thought the design lacked variety, rhythm, proportion, depth, and shadow–all things that made for good design. Commenting on the rendering showing the 2nd Street sidewalk full of people, he said these only served to obscure the sameness of the facade, and he noted there was almost no foot traffic on 2nd Street now, and did not think the building would offer any reason for people to go there, especially since the sidewalk would be so impossibly narrow.

All those wishing to speak having been heard, the Chairman had some questions for the developer and the architect relating to ways in which the project could be broken up and the apparent size on 2nd Street reduced. First, now that he understood that the datum for determining height could be measured from either F or H Street, he asked why the project could not be separated into two buildings–for example, buildings 1 and 2 comprising one section and buildings 3 and 4 another? This would make it easier to get daylight into offices and would give some relief to the great expanse on 2nd Street. Mr. Braunohler said the problem with that was that a large tenant, of the size of the SEC, for example, might want to expand but would not want to move half his offices into another separate building. The Chairman commented that the buildings could easily be connected underground. Mr. Braunohler then said he did not think they could afford to give up the FAR required to separate the buildings. Mr. Capoccia asked if there were any other buildings in Washington with floor plates as large as this one, and Mr. Braunohler said there were; in answer to a further question from Mr. Capoccia, he said one floor plate would probably be occupied by two tenants rather than one.

The Chairman commented on other large buildings in Washington–the Capitol, Union Station and the National Gallery of art–noting that all of them were broken up in such a way that the length did not become noticeable. Mr. Roche said his building was quite different in that it could not be seen from any distance, had no axial approach, and no grand space in front of it. Mr. Brown thought that might even make the effect worse, but Mr. Roche did not think so; he cited the example of a long row of Georgian houses, similar in style and with a more or less even cornice line. Mr. Brown did not agree because he said the small houses were all different and each had its own character; in Mr. Roche's building it was the dehumanizing effect of the long, unchanging facade that bothered him.

The Vice-Chairman asked Mr. Roche if he had enough leeway with the height to set the building back another 20-30 feet from 2nd Street above the second story plinth and add another floor at the rear (west); Mr. Roche said he didn't think they would be able to do that. The Chairman asked Mr. Braunohler what the timetable with the SEC was; he was told they had to get started with Building 1 immediately so the SEC could occupy the building by the end of December 2003, but the agency had three years to advise them on whether or not they wanted Building 2. The Vice-Chairman suggested that the Commission could approve the first two buildings, since their scale and that of the adjoining properties worked well, and then work on the problems seen with the other buildings, or alternately,

find that they were approvable as presented. Mr. Roche said he would have to have approval for the entire substructure and ramp since they had to be constructed during the initial stage. The Chairman said he would have no problem with that. Mr. Sherwood said they were going before the Zoning Commission in November and would have to show the entire plan and say the Commission of Fine Arts had approved part of it, but had not yet approved the other part; when they had this approval, they would come back and show it to the Zoning Commission. On that basis, the Vice-Chairman moved that the Commission approve Scheme 2 for buildings 1 and 2 and the access to them; Mr. Capoccia seconded the motion and it was carried, with Mrs. Brody in opposition. She felt that approving the project in increments, especially when the options were not that broad, was a mistake, both philosophically and practically speaking. Exhibits J and J-1

f. Appendix II. The Assistant Secretary said the staff had changed its opinion on one item, and that was for a rooftop dish antenna on the roof of La Colline restaurant at 400 North Capitol Street. After a site inspection, it appeared that it would have been very intrusive, and the recommendation was made for a smaller antenna or a change in the position to a back corner, away from Capitol Hill. It was agreed by all that this was preferable, and with that change, the Appendix was unanimously approved.

III. INSPECTION

Freer Gallery of Art, object proposed for acquisition. Ms. Kohler said that because the Freer wanted to put this item on display in a matter of days, and because they knew this meeting would be a very long one, they had sent a photograph of the item and an explanation of what it was and its importance to the collection. She showed the photograph of a royal decree (a farman or firman) from the reign of the Mughal emperor Akbar (1556 to 1605), a rare example relating to the Jain community and the prohibition of the killing of animals, and she read a translation of the text. There was unanimous agreement that the farman would be a worthy addition to the Freer's collection, and the Chairman signed the approval form. Exhibit K

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

All right, so let's start in with the submissions and reviews. The first comes under the Shipstead-Luce Act, the Corcoran Gallery, addition and alteration, a concept submission.

MR. ATHERTON: Right. This is the first submission of this design. We have not seen previous designs that were submitted for the competition and I just mention that because a lot of people I think feel that this Commission has already looked at another design and I want to make that very clear for the record, that this is the first time that the Commission has seen a design for this.

I think we can go directly to the project and ask David Levy to open with any remarks he'd like to make.

MR. LEVY: Thank you, Charlie.

I'm going to be a little formal. I think Frank will provide the informalities.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Commission of Fine Arts, thank you very much for providing us with the opportunity to be with you this morning.

Today's presentation follows a disciplined and rigorous process through which we have examined the architectural requirements of our institution, as well as its responsibilities to the urban fabric of its setting.

The process began in the winter of 1998 when the Corcoran commissioned a preliminary program study as baseline data in the selection of an architect for its new and final wing. Starting in July of that year and continuing for the next 12 months, a selection committee comprised of trustees, professional staff and consultants considered the work of some 200 architects, carefully reviewing the qualifications of 60 of them and narrowing the field to 10 with whom detailed interview presentations were conducted. Three finalists were commissioned to present design concepts for this project. The outcome, as you know, is the selection of Frank O. Gehry and Partners in the early summer of 1999.

For the past two years the Gehry organization has been developing and refining the ideas with which this undertaking began. Today we are presenting the results of our work together in a public forum for the first time.

We know and the press has underscored that our project has great meaning for the civic enterprise in Washington as it begins the 21st century. It is also a response to the obligation unique to museums of art to view their buildings as important parts of their collections, works of art in and of themselves.

But in these particularly troubled times, this work of art and architecture takes on a special meaning and holds even more important significance. The successful completion of this project will bring new life to one of our city's most venerated historic structures. The largest building open to the public in immediate proximity to the White House, it will speak eloquently, powerfully and dramatically to the optimism with which this new century began. Through its creative power and its commitment to new and imaginative ideas, the building we are presenting today will stand as a beacon of those values which are at the very core of civilized society. It will be an important affirmation of our faith in the energy and vitality of American life and culture as we go forward with confidence at this difficult moment in our history.

It has been truly said that art can help heal the wounds of hatred and distrust, knitting together disparate peoples and cultures through its special and transcendent power. Art and architecture are also both the symbols and the reality that become the abiding documents of history and of the human spirit. This building will be part of these great traditions.

By bringing our nation's capital the creative imagination of Frank Gehry, one of the most distinguished artist/architects of our times, we wish to realize our

own dreams and to fulfill our unique responsibilities as Washington's oldest museum and largest privately supported cultural institution.

We also hope to continue the great and symbolic architectural legacy of our city. We see our new building as an act of civic responsibility, a gift to future generations of Americans and to visitors from every land who come here to celebrate at the source the freedom and the creative imagination that have so profoundly distinguished our country.

Therefore, on behalf of the trustees of the Corcoran Gallery of Art and its chairman, Ronald Abramson, I am very pleased to present Frank O. Gehry, who will make the formal presentation of this project to you. Frank?

MR. GEHRY: I'm afraid I'm not very formal.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I've never seen you in such dark clothes.

MR. GEHRY: First time I've worn a tie in years.

It's a great pleasure to be here. I've heard and watched you guys over the years as you've deliberated on many things and I know how serious a job you have and never expected to be here myself, presenting.

In fact, I didn't want to enter this competition. I thought me in Washington? It ain't going to work. But we got here, fair and square, as they say.

The competition--when you do a competition you don't have time to meet with clients. You don't have time to meet with groups like this. You don't have time to really understand the feelings of the community, although I have spent a lot of time in Washington working for the Rouse Company for years, so I know it pretty well.

The competition always has more area than anybody can afford and the program is much different always than what you end up with. That's been our experience on every competition. As soon as you win, then they tell you what the real budget is and then they tell you what the real program is and what the real dreams are, and so on.

Having said that, the competition did serve a purpose because it was shown publicly and we heard what people thought of it and what I'm presenting today responds to that, that the original design was a bit over the top, it was taking on the Flagg building in an ungainly way, and we agreed with some of those points. And so it did serve to hear from the community and the press their feelings about it and as the project developed, I think David Levy, the Corcoran and I spent time addressing those issues with the new design.

Part of the program we were able to retain by going under into the vault under the street, which we hadn't known about before. So that allowed us to maintain some of the program below grade. And when we discovered we could put skylights on that space, that was a perfect place for the art school because it was below grade but it could get top light and could be made into a spectacular space.

And so the art school doesn't get short-changed. It has an identity. The kids that go there will feel like they're in a special environment. And I think symbolically as you enter the Corcoran through the new opening you'll be looking down at the art school and you'll know it's there, the presence of the art school. And I've always felt that museums that have an art school and make their presence known are the richer for it, so I feel very good about how all that turned out.

I'm not going to go into plans too much but the New York Avenue entrance will become an additional entrance to the 17th Street entrance. So this will become now the main entrance, which has a car drop-off and will make it easier to access.

We've added about 14 new galleries and they are designed so they're contiguous. They link so you can walk through them.

We don't do very much to the Flagg building and the Platt building. We refurbish the galleries in the Platt building, bring them back to their original luster because some of them are used for offices and things like that now. And we do a lot of repair which I was sure was going to have to happen when we started this job and I said I don't want to touch that thing but inevitably you can't do the new without doing the old. So the two are contiguous, whether we like it or not.

The interior, we don't touch much of it but we keep the doorway and then back here we create an overlook into the new atrium, which is accessible from New York Avenue. The student entrance is here. There are elevators and stairways down to the lower levels.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: So this means, just to clarify, that the present rotunda will be demolished?

MR. GEHRY: Yes. The present rotunda was an addition with the Platt wing and it seemed as such that it was, even though it's beautiful in its character, it's kind of a stage set and the trade-offs in this new wing seemed to merit it. Now we can argue each way but it seemed like it was worth it in terms of what you can get.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Can you explain in section what you do get?

MR. GEHRY: I don't know if this section shows it. This would be coming through on axis of the stairway; from the Flagg building you would see this and I have a picture of it in the slides I'll show you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Oh, you're going to show slides. Sorry.

MR. GEHRY: This is the school underneath with the skylights.

Okay, let's go for slides. I don't do a lot of interiors in the slides.

Of course, this is the existing 17th Street entrance and this was the competition.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Maybe we could ask the director how sure are we that the 17th Street door will remain open?

MR. LEVY: You're asking me?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Yes.

MR. LEVY: Well, certainly that is the plan. We want to keep the main atrium, the Flagg atrium very active and we see that as a secondary or even almost a secondary/primary entrance. One of our experiences in the last couple of years has been that when we have a lot of activity in the building we really need the two entrances just to accommodate the amount of public and keep a flow of traffic. So I think that we have every expectation that that entrance will be open.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Have you done any budgeting as far as guards in every position as far as--

MR. LEVY: Yes, we have taken that into consideration.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Good.

MR. GEHRY: This is the model of the competition. These are just for your information, some of the studies. We did hundreds of them. As anybody who's been to our office knows, we circle the field a lot as we study this stuff. So this was a very blocky piece.

Then we tried glass, which would have been beautiful, but the budget, in order to make this not a standard curtain wall so that it would be something greater than that, would have been very expensive and we abandoned it.

This are just on the way to the form, as it were. This is the first one that kind of caught my interest because I was originally trying to use the same marble that the Flagg building had and I thought these glowing marble pieces could have been beautiful but alas, that was difficult.

The issue for me was always if you make a building that attaches itself to the Flagg building it leaves this big neighbor out of the picture and in terms of the urban design issues, this is, whether you like it or not, this guy is here and the facade, the organization of the facade has to take it into account. So in the end, it seemed like making a new piece that kind of, if you'll forgive my poetry, holds hands with the two neighbors.

So that's what we ended up doing, where the elements talk to each other, respect each other's volume and we go no higher than the 90 feet of the tallest building and we come down to the height of the Flagg building, creating a new entry, glass entry. This was another study before this.

The entrance to the school and, as Ben Forgey said, a little sexy flip of the skirt. I tend to do that.

MS. NELSON: A loading dock.

MR. GEHRY: No, the loading dock is up here.

The materials we've been looking at are stainless steel. Now titanium always--I haven't used titanium since Bilbao because it's very expensive. In Bilbao we lucked out; the market came in under stainless for that. The only reason to revisit titanium and when this starts up we'll certainly revisit it, is that it has a softness in the light. In the grey light it turns golden. They've just used it in a Lexus ad that's quite beautiful; if you're watching TV you'll see that golden color is just extraordinary. So it's not out of the question that we might revisit it.

These are just scorings of the model making. It wouldn't be like that. The scorings would be more regular by necessity.

These are the skylights down to the art school, so there's a kind of entry bridge that goes past the two skylights into a skylit atrium. And this is it from the top. So the bridge, the drop-off, the atrium cover.

The competition model, which shows--we did at that point have a floor coming up in here and that's not here. Then all of this is cut way back down to a nicer scale, I think, with the two buildings.

That's what you would have seen. This is a head-on shot that you probably would never see but at the worst, that's what you'll see from 17th.

The new entrance with the 17th Street entrance. When you go in on axis and look into the new atrium, this is what you would see. The galleries are built rectilinear, almost like a quarry and there would be stairs and access up to the different levels and these galleries are contiguous with the other galleries. So on axis you would see this, very sculptural. There's the entrance and the college is down below.

This is the section of the college, the college atrium. These were the first models where we started to see it working, where the college was just under a glass floor which, of course, we couldn't do. And these are just studies for the college below. So you would get a lot of light in. We then decided to bring the forms of the outside down into here. So that's the same view, the college, the classrooms, stairways and students and the view from New York Avenue and the skylight up here for the atrium.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Could you just go back? So what we're understanding is that down below grade in the college the silver forms will continue?

MR. GEHRY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: That's great.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGLE: Excuse me, Frank. You mentioned an atrium bridge.

MR. GEHRY: That's here.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGLE: Horizontal rather than--can you point out where that is?

MR. GEHRY: Here it is. That's the bridge.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGLE: And what's on either side of the bridge?

MR. GEHRY: These skylights that bring light down into the school.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: So that's fully handicapped-accessible then, those steps?

MR. GEHRY: Oh, yes, absolutely.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGLE: There will be some rail of some kind that separates the bridge from the building and--

MR. GEHRY: Yes. We didn't get into those details. I'm sure we'll come back to you with all of that stuff. You went right to the Achilles heel. That's the hardest thing to do, is figure out something that isn't an ungainly handrail that deals with this and I'm sure there's an idea but we just haven't solved it completely.

So this is the view from E Street with the skylight and, of course, this is a repeat of what you saw.

These are just views walking around the building as you would see them from the corner. They're like big sails and I'm a sailor; I guess I like the feeling of the wind in the sails and the sense that that gives of movement. But the linkage between these two, making a total composition, was the important part for me. And when you made it more like this, then it didn't look good and when you made it blocky it started to look like this. So that's probably the greatest rationalization for why I did it, but that's the way I saw it.

This view is kind of nice.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Can we get a couple of heads to duck for just a minute so we can see?

MR. GEHRY: This is an important view.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Although the cars going in that direction, pedestrians will see that and there's a lot of it because the Union building is set back, thanks to this Commission. Gordon Bunshaft wanted it to be orthogonal with Rawlins Park, which has given you this wonderful opportunity.

MR. GEHRY: Did Gordon design this?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: No, but the Commission of the day apparently did not want it to come out, which it had a perfect right to do, and be parallel to New York Avenue. So that allowed you this wonderful facade from the west.

MS. NELSON: What would you say is the thickness of the material at these points?

MR. GEHRY: Here?

MS. NELSON: Right at the end of the point where it comes down.

MR. GEHRY: There's a return, a horizontal return under it, so you're not getting the thin edge.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: From a practical point of view, will an art delivery truck be able to go all the way in and be locked up overnight if a shipment comes in late? Have you all allowed for that or isn't there enough space?

MR. GEHRY: I think so.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Because that's a wonderful feature, David, if you can do it. A lot of times these trucks come in and you want to get them under the security perimeter.

MR. GEHRY: Yes, that would be possible to create a very tight security perimeter.

MR. LEVY: I think that was the intention, Carter. I think that the truck is there sort of symbolically so you'll understand that--

CHAIRMAN BROWN: We hope it's in the process of backing up.

MR. GEHRY: Yes, it can back up a little further.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Everybody's loading dock is their eyesore side and it would be tough to have to have this facade permanently marred or semi-permanently marred by some stupid truck that's sitting there messing up the vista. It would be interesting from the visual point of view, which is our concern, but from the museum point of view it would also be useful to carve out enough cubic space back there so it could really go in and lock up.

MR. CAPOCCIA: Mr. Chairman, another potential eyesore here would be the installation of Jersey barriers. In your final approach here how do you think you will look at the security of the building itself? Where we are today every time I turn around another building is being secured with Jersey barriers.

MR. GEHRY: Jersey barriers? I'm not--

MR. CAPOCCIA: Those are the cast concrete slabs that keep intruders away.

MR. GEHRY: Oh. Well, I guess we should really rethink that in light of this and maybe provide for that. That wasn't paramount in our thinking when we started this.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: You've got a lot of glass there. Your perimeter is pretty vulnerable.

MR. GEHRY: Yes, we should probably rethink that, take that under consideration.

MR. CAPOCCIA: If you drive around Washington you'll see there's all different approaches to--

MR. GEHRY: No, I understand. I didn't know the term that you used.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: It was a problem before September 11 and now in this atmosphere we really have a problem.

MR. GEHRY: These surfaces look scaleless on these models and they would have texture so that the texture would then bring them into the reality of the texture with the rest of the--

CHAIRMAN BROWN: What do you mean by texture? A kind of grid?

MR. GEHRY: Well, it would be lines of joints that would go through.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And made up of plates?

MR. GEHRY: They're made up of plates and the plates can be two or three feet long by a couple of feet high.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGLE: I saw it in one of the earlier slides.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Well, he said those were not relevant. Those were seams for the model-making.

MR. GEHRY: They would be more in scale with the detail on these buildings. I think when you see that, finally it would bring it into a reality. I think when you look at the pictures that are newsprint-type pictures like this, you get more a sense of the texture that will really be there. I think that's an important point because for me, when I look at them, they bother me that they're so--

CHAIRMAN BROWN: If those plates are at slightly different angles you're going to get this kind of oil can variegation effect.

MR. GEHRY: We're planning--

CHAIRMAN BROWN: --right in plane with each other, right? Or not.

MR. GEHRY: We're planning to use a thick enough material not to get oil canning. The oil canning was something that was inevitable in every building so I

started to use it and it started to look like stong (phonetic) if you blinked because it had this kind of irregular surface, and I loved the scale of it.

In this case we're thinking of not doing that but it's something we'll certainly be thinking about as we go along.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: You can control the plates so that they'll--

MR. GEHRY: The thickness of the metal. So like Bilbao has a third of a millimeter thick, so the oil canning is--it's very thin material and it even flutters sometimes in a strong wind so it's kind of interesting. It plays with the light.

MS. BRODY: You talked about titanium going golden over time. If you don't go that route and you stay with the aluminum, what happens over time?

MR. GEHRY: It stays just the way it is. Stainless steel just stays the way it is. And we're doing some buildings in stainless now that are large surfaces like this that will be finished in the next year, so we'll have examples to look at. We will also, when we go forward, build big, full-scale mock-ups here so that the Commission will be able to see the study and get involved with that with us and comment on the way we're going. I hope once we know we're moving, we'll do all of that. And we'll show you titanium and stainless and we'll agonize together, I think, about all of that.

But the titanium does beautiful things in the grey light. It's just impossible to get--I've never had a material that does that so well, but it's a lot more money.

Then a dramatic view at night.

MR. CAPOCCIA: What would be your idea of the material that we would see through the entry glazing?

MR. GEHRY: The budget will tell us what. At one point I wanted that to be the same marble as this, which would be--

MR. CAPOCCIA: Create a great linkage.

MR. GEHRY: Ideal. If we could do that, that would be absolutely incredible. If we can't do that, we'll do something like it or we'll create that sense because it would be great to look through and feel like this is threading through there. That's what I'd like to do, then some day cover this with the same white marble. That would be the ideal--cover this with the white marble, put the white marble in here and we've got a perfect ensemble.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Well, museums are always expanding. That's phase three, I guess.

MR. GEHRY: Well, David's got to fund-raise a little more.

I am finished with my story, if you have questions. We can turn on the lights.

I was asked whether I was personally compromised.

MS. NELSON: Whether you left something in the first model that--

MR. GEHRY: No, no, I love the interaction with the client, with the community. In Berlin where we did a completely very simple facade, and Carter has seen it, I get asked all the time did I compromise and absolutely not. I love that facade. It's one of the best things I've ever done.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And in Paris at the American Center the streetscape is very contextual with the rest of the street and the riverside.

MR. GEHRY: So I think it will be very contextual when you see it done, like the--

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I'd like to clarify what Charlie Atherton said because this is the first time this Commission as a Commission has reviewed it in formal public session. However, the original model was on view to the public and Commission

members were part of the public. We all saw it and saw exactly what was going on and were not happy. So we were perhaps part of the general public input that--

MR. GEHRY: You were.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right, do we have any comments from--

MR. GEHRY: This picture shows the texture. It gives you an idea.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I suppose before we go to the Commission members we should see if there are members of the community who'd like to speak. Anyone here?

MR. GEHRY: They're speechless.

MS. STURDZA: I'm Elena Sturdza. I'm a local architect. I'm the winner of the competition for the United Arab Emirates Chancery and lead designer for a 53-story office building in Houston and, of course, other buildings.

First of all, I have to say that Mr. Frank Gehry is perhaps the most important architect of the peaceful end of the 20th century. The addition to the Corcoran building is indeed an unusual architectural work with great artistic values. It certainly strikes out of the ordinary. It wants to be for architecture, though, what reality TV shows are for entertaining, like Survivor and bungy-jumping.

But unfortunately, after the recent events, those are not popular anymore and neither should be a building which mimics a collision or a crash in order to produce a high impact on one's emotions.

It is a powerful image because it is unsettling but in peaceful times this was pleasant. Now I wonder. After I saw yesterday the newspaper I was shocked. It does resemble a kind of, to me, the remains of a giant airplane or a collision of some sort. I wonder if the forms, the shapes--I'm not against curved shapes but if they could somehow be orderly, organized and be inviting and create an entrance that is not so overwhelming. You're down under those masses of metal and those shapes do not resemble anything but something that we've never seen and we've never heard before. This is the high impact on our emotions.

I really think it should complement the buildings and to remind of the history of this city. It is a sculptural work of art but it's too totally strange and foreign to the architecture of Washington, D.C.

I think a good place would be in a park surrounded by open space around it. To me, it overpowers the building that it's supposed to complement.

It has great qualities but something is going far beyond what a piece of architecture should be. It's more like an amorphic mass. It doesn't have an entrance. It doesn't have a face like we're used to in other buildings. It's all one piece made out of equal other pieces and nothing is just pointing out and does not express the functions. It kind of hides the function beyond. The building doesn't speak out from inside.

I think the other, the wining entry was more interesting. Those masses were kind of flying and this is too vertical, too overpowering and I think it's lost qualities.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I think we take your point. Thank you very much.

Are there other comments that anyone in the community would like to make?

All right, members of the Commission, do you have other questions of the architect or comments to make?

MS. BRODY: Can I make a comment that is at odds--it's a comment I would have made initially and it's at odds particularly with what was just said. That is that when we saw your first design I actually was concerned that you didn't have enough space, which I wanted you to have. I was concerned that it was too complicated and it

was too fussy, too overwhelming to the landmark. I frankly couldn't understand how you were going to figure it out.

And I'm delighted to see this because I think it has a scale and an elegance and to a certain extent a simplicity within what you do that I find appealing.

I particularly--I am somebody who is hysterical since 9/11, as everyone knows, and I'm concerned and as unsettled and I don't find this in any way unsettling. In fact, I find it calming. I find it elegant. I find it reassuring. Not for one second did I have any vision of airplanes or anything. Again, as people know, I'm sort of hyperreacting to that. I didn't feel that at all.

So I don't think that this heightens any emotional impact relevant to 9/11 that any--certainly in my case, that we have. In fact, as I say, I think it does have an elegance and a sort of beauty and respect for the site and respect for the context.

So that's sort of my overarching view. I would have one point, which is a question, about the entrance and I'm just curious to hear what other people think. That is that you want to be able to round this corner and see this building, both the sculpture and that there is an entrance there. I may not see it exactly but to me, the entrance seems possibly a little narrow or a little set back and it may not read quite as much as you might want as an entrance rounding that corner. I'm delighted that it reads as sculpture but I think we're saying that it's also the entry and a welcoming point and I just wonder if it isn't a little diminutive in that regard.

MR. GEHRY: I think that the skylights that become part of this--you can see it here--would be seen and we saw that as leading up to the entrance, so at this point and maybe as we develop it--at one point we had them all contiguous and like one piece. So I think that you would see it that way.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Actually, to pursue your language of the two buildings holding hands, I saw the entrance almost as an embrace to the visitor as the building billows and flows around it. And as you point out, there are lots of details for that front entrance that must be worked out from the--

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Including signage, banners, advertising of exhibitions.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Bollards. Those are all of the elements that make it a functioning building.

And to respond in some small measure to the thoughtful comments, with which I completely differ, of the earlier speaker, it does have a peaceful and lofty quality. And happily for you and your publics that you are meant to serve, there are enough Gehry buildings in Central Europe and Western Europe, in California, Washington lucky enough about to have one and we in New York certainly hope so, that these forms are no longer alien forms. In fact, we look for a new interpretation of them.

And I think the very discipline that you exert in this iteration in terms of its context, its regard for Washington, its regard for the Flagg building, its regard for the Platt addition, it's very thoughtful and frankly exhilarating to watch.

So from what's to be hoped a future user, we'd like this building built in this lifetime, David. It's wonderful.

MR. CAPOCCIA: It is a beautiful design and I agree with what Barbara said. However, I have to say that I think it's critically important that this component be clearly linked with the Corcoran Gallery, as distinguished from the Union building. I mean they all are one piece of urban architecture but to the extent that you are able to create a linkage and some design treatment, whether it's on the sidewalk, the pavement, the glazings we mentioned, I just wanted to reiterate what I thought was--

MR. GEHRY: I agree. It's a subtlety and I think it could be important. I agree.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Any other comments?

MS. RAFSHOON: I think it's a beautiful solution and a great gift to Washington. I would really encourage the Corcoran to find a titanium angel because I think it will be warmer and more inviting.

MR. GEHRY: Yes, that would be just beautiful.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, of all the blocks in Washington, D.C. this is probably the most appropriate block in which this could happen. It's been described in the press as a hyphen. I see it as an exclamation point.

If you know this block in the grid of the city, it's a background block. You can walk across it a thousand times and never know what's there. Now we've given it life. We've given it a certain spirit and that's something that needs to happen in Washington.

It is one of the great background building blocks of Washington, D.C. and now it has life and it's an appropriate statement.

MR. GEHRY: My AIA brothers will have something to look at.

MS. NELSON: I'm very excited to see it. You feel like you want to go inside the sculpture. I'm really drawn to seeing how you get into it.

I think also, since it's an art school, this is not a federal building, it's a school, it's a place where innovation and I think art is saying something that you've never seen before. So it's very appropriate to have a little confusion going on and I think that's what an artist wants.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I would like to simply corroborate everything that's been said around this table.

Dealing first of all with the entrance, I think the element of surprise is going to be very exciting. I think of Petra when you come in, the very narrow gorge. And I think of that Frank Lloyd Wright building in San Francisco that's a small shop and you walk from St. Francis Square along this blank brick wall and then suddenly there's this little arched entrance and it's as if a hand came out and sucked you into that shop because it develops a kind of vacuum suction that will be very hard not to submit to. So I think the entrance can be very exciting.

What appeals to me, I write down the word calm. For those of us who know Gehry's architecture, this is an extraordinarily reserved building. It's part of its appropriateness to Washington.

MR. GEHRY: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: That it should be so simple and pure. I like to make the verbal differentiation between classical and classic because a classical is to ape the previous historicist styles, putting in all the columns and pilasters, but if the design quality is good enough it's no longer a question of style; it's a question of quality. I think we can see that elsewhere. Certainly the East Building did not ape John Russell Pope's style of classicism and yet produces a classic.

And I think in the same ways, this building has a reserve and a purity that will wear well because one worries that we get very excited about a certain kind of style and everybody wants to be Frank Gehry and the landscape is going to be littered with wannabees but if you get the real stuff it's a great privilege.

I find that the emotional content of it is really one of joy. It has a certain whimsy but it also has that staying power and that solidity which you expect in a great art museum.

It is a work of sculpture. Art museums collects sculpture. Why shouldn't this be the greatest acquisition that it's ever made?

So I would say go in peace. I'd like to add a footnote that I think, as a Commission, we are somewhat insulted that the press should assume we don't know

what we're doing and have to be instructed. The last time the Washington Post tried to influence this Commission was when it ran a piece by Tom Wolfe saying that the Vietnam Memorial should not be built because it was a product of the mullahs of modernism. I don't think we're too affected by what the press says.

And the amount of lobbying that's gone on, attempted lobbying of the Commission members is totally out of line and we hope in the future the management of the Corcoran can cool its jets and allow this Commission to do its business its way.

But this said, it does not change our opinion. I'm wildly enthusiastic about this design and really congratulate you and everybody involved.

So I think it's time for a vote if there are no further comments.

MR. ROBINSON: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Do we have a motion to approve?

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Moved.

MS. BRODY: Second.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right, let's take a formal vote. It's an important historic moment. All those in favor?

[Chorus of ayes.]

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Opposed?

You got it.

[Applause.]

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: --so that when you come back do not expect such a unanimous response. It's really been a delight and encouragement to see how sympathetic you have been both to the comments of the community and to the needs of the museum and the school. And it is to be hoped for other architects designing buildings some source of perhaps even inspiration.

MR. GEHRY: I hope so. I hope I'm back here sooner than later.

MR. CAPOCCIA: I would rename the principal existing entrance something other than secondary entrance.

MR. GEHRY: Okay.

MS. BRODY: Just to be helpful.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right, we're going to declare a very quick adjournment because there's a lot to clear out here. We'll be back in 10 minutes.

[Recess.]

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

31 October 2001

EXHIBIT A-1

Dear Mayor Williams:

During its 18 October 2001 meeting, the Commission reviewed, as authorized by the Shipstead-Luce Act, the concept submission for an addition to the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and unanimously approved the proposal (Case number S.L. 01-082). The members were pleased with the direction the design has taken since the competition-winning scheme by Frank O. Gehry, FAIA, was presented to the public in the summer of 1999. They felt the submitted concept design was respectful of the historic gallery building, designed by Ernest Flagg, and that it will make an exciting addition. By filling the existing void, it will bring a unique and very notable facade to New York Avenue that complements the site. This new structure will not only enhance the operations of the Corcoran Gallery and Art School but will add significantly to the experience afforded by this city's excellent art galleries. As was said during the presentation, it is a building for a new century and the Commission could not agree more.

As with most new structures the Commission reviews, there were a few items for which additional consideration and study was recommended, one of which was the incorporation of security features into the addition from the outset, rather than risking unsightly add-ons later. The members commented on the apparent vulnerability of the street-level skylights to vehicular damage. Perhaps a small strengthened parapet or knee-wall should surround the skylights rather than a string of bollards. Another recommendation made was to recess and enclose the service dock so that a delivery truck could be completely secured while unloading its cargo. This would also have the added benefit of screening these "back of the house" functions from public view.

The Commission looks forward to reviewing the design as it develops and provide the services of its staff should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Anthony A. Williams
Mayor of the District of Columbia
Government of the District of Columbia
441 4th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

cc: Frank O. Gehry, FAIA
David Levy, Corcoran Gallery of Art
David Maloney, DC Office of Historic Preservation

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT B

31 October 2001

Dear Mr. Earle:

During its meeting of 18 October 2001, the Commission reviewed and approved the concept submission for the United States Marine Corps 8th and I Streets Barracks Annex and Band Facility, to be located at 7th and L Streets in southeast Washington, D.C. The members were pleased that the project will improve not only the Marines' quarters and the music support facilities but the neighboring area as well. It should greatly help revitalize this portion of the city.

The members made several recommendations during the presentation about the south facade of the barracks wing and the brick selection that warrant additional study. It was felt that the elevation of the barracks wing facing L Street could be further articulated to breakup the long uninterrupted facade. Perhaps a central bay or pavilion with a pediment could be introduced to reduce its scale and give a sense of balance. The ground level arcades flanking the barracks wing were thought to be too shallow and too low. The arcades should be open, airy and inviting, especially as they will be used as a primary exterior passage. The main entrance at the southeast corner should have a solid lintel over the opening, to support, visually, the wall above.

The color of the brick should be carefully selected so that the building relates to the historic barracks compound and fits in with the adjacent structures. The brick sample that was presented was felt to be too light in color -- perhaps, a darker red brick would be more appropriate.

In addition, the members all agreed that the garage structure should be configured with the more efficient "double-loaded" scheme even though it slightly intrudes on the 6th Street view corridor. This was felt to be an acceptable compromise, as it would allow for a more generous setback from L Street and reduce the structure's footprint.

The Commission looks forward to the review of the development of the design and to providing the services of its staff should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Lawrence P. Earle
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity Chesapeake
1314 Harwood Street, SE
Washington, DC 20374-5018

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

31 October 2001

Dear Mr. Earle:

At its meeting on 18 October 2001, the Commission reviewed and unanimously approved the concept design for the addition to the Defense Intelligence Analysis Center at Bolling Air Force Base. The members found the concept design to be a complementary contrast to the existing building. The design team should be commended for rethinking the obvious strategy simply to replicate additional stepped modules of the original scheme which, in the Commission's opinion, has resulted in confusing circulation and other deficiencies in organization. The proposed scheme has the advantage of redefining the building's entrance and apparent openness, allowing the majority of the building's offices access to natural light. In addition, it provides a northern edge to the central ceremonial green and a terminus to Luke Avenue, both of which will help order and delineate Bolling Air Force Base's urban landscape.

The Commission looks forward to the review of the development of the design and is happy to provide the services of its staff should questions arise in the interim.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Lawrence P. Earle
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity Chesapeake
1314 Harwood Street, SE
Washington, DC 20374-5018

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

31 October 2001

Dear Mr. Maj:

During its meeting on 18 October 2001, the Commission reviewed and approved working drawings for Phase IV of the Columbarium at Arlington National Cemetery. The design, details, landscape plan and materials for the two new courts and the Ceremonial Shelter conform to the existing structures for the earlier phases. One exception is the lengthening of the courts by 34 feet to accommodate additional niches. The members appreciate the need for this modification and believe it is handled well, as there will be no change to the configuration of the interior space as approved in the original master plan.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Ronald J. Maj, P.E.
Chief, Design Branch
Engineering Division
Department of the Army
Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 1715
Baltimore, MD 21203-1715

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT E

31 October 2001

Dear Ms. Barber:

During its meeting on18 October 2001, the Commission reviewed and approved the realignment of McNair Road at Fort Myer. This modification will improve safety, simplify traffic flow and set the stage for the future renovation of the forecourt for the Old Post Chapel.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Edna M. Barber
Chief, Environmental Division
Department of the Army
Headquarters, United States Army Garrison, FT, Myer
204 Lee Avenue
Fort Myer, Virginia 22211-1199

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT F

31 October 2001

Dear Mr. Rombach:

The Commission was pleased to see you during its meeting of 18 October 2001 for the review of the concept design for the Smithsonian Mall-wide Exterior Sign Program. The members approved the concept design for the individual sign units, provided a uniform color and graphic system is developed for the information signs. The location and number of signs to be included in the program, however, were not approved. A request was made for a survey of all existing signs and banners currently in place around the Mall museums. The survey should be comprehensive and identify signs to be removed. Other informational signs, such as the BID directional signs and NPS kiosks should be included in the survey. The concern was that perhaps there were too many signs proposed for these already congested sidewalks. Perhaps simple cardboard mockups can be assembled to help visualize their placement and size.

The Commission looks forward to another look at this proposal. Please resubmit when ready. As always, the staff is available should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Harry Rombach, RA
Associate Director for Facilities Master Planning
Smithsonian Institution
750 9th Street, NW, Suite 5200
Washington, D.C. 20560

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT G

31 October 2001

Dear Mr. Parsons:

During its meeting on 18 October 2001, the Commission reviewed and enthusiastically approved the general concept design for the proposed boathouse facility for Georgetown University to be built on the Potomac up stream from the Washington Canoe Club. The design was also warmly received by the Commissions' Old Georgetown Board who reviewed the concept design at its meeting on 4 October 2001. We understand a land swap between the Park Service and the University is needed to make this property available for the boathouse.

We look forward to the review of the development of the design and details. As always, the staff is available to assist in the review process.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. John Parsons
Acting Regional Director
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service
National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, SW
Washington, DC 20242

cc: Alan Brangman, Georgetown University
Stephen Muse, FAIA, Muse Architects

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT H

31 October 2001

Dear Mr. Block:

At its meeting on 18 October 2001, the Commission reviewed and unanimously approved the revised concept design for the renovation of and addition to the historic John Strong Thomson Elementary School at 12th and L Streets in northwest Washington. The members found the revised elevations to be much improved. The design team should be complimented on their endeavors to design a school addition on such a restrictive and challenging site and for their efforts to preserve the existing historic school building.

The Commission looks forward to the review of the final construction drawings and the selection of materials when ready. Please contact the staff for assistance should the need arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Stanley N. Block, P.E.
Chief, Design Management Branch
Department of the Army
Baltimore District, US Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 1715
Baltimore, MD 21203-1715

cc: Walter Hernson, DCPS
Sarah Woodhead, DCPS
Antoine Plessy, US Army Corps of Engineers
Louis Fry III, AIA, Lance Bailey & Assoc.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT I

31 October 2001

Dear Mr. Block:

At its meeting on 18 October 2001, the Commission reviewed the concept proposal for the modernization project for the historic Noyes Elementary School at 10th and Franklin Streets in northeast Washington. The members approved the concept submission for the project with the recommendation for additional study of the elevations of the new construction. The desire is to make the new structures feel less institutional and to enliven the facades, particularly the two-story block that fronts the play areas. In addition, a suggestion was made to refine the detailing on the one-story classroom wing so that it is more in character with the historic structure.

The Commission looks forward to the review of the final construction drawings and the selection of materials when ready. As always, the staff is available to review any changes made and to assist you and the design team should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Stanley N. Block, P.E.
Chief, Design Management Branch
Department of the Army
Baltimore District, US Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 1715
Baltimore, MD 21203-1715

cc: Walter Hernson, DCPS
Sarah Woodhead, DC PS
Antoine Plessy, US Army Corps of Engineers
Wayne Scott, McKissack and McKissack

18 October 2001

EXHIBIT J

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE
AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 01-082	500 17th Street, NW The Corcoran Gallery of Art	Addition and alterations - Concept.

RECOMMENDATION: Approved: See attached letter.

S.L. 02-001	1201, 1301 & 1399 Maryland Avenue, SW The Portals	Two new office buildings - Revised concept.

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed two new office buildings as shown in drawings received and dated 4 October 2001. Recommend further study to strengthen the 90-foot cornice line with additional setbacks on the upper floors. File new submission of the development of the concept design with details for review by the Commission when ready. (Previous: S.L. 01-070).

S.L. 02-002	E Street, SW- north side (Between 3rd and 4th streets) Washington Marriott Residence Inn Hotel	New 13-story hotel Concept.

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed new hotel as shown in drawings received and dated 4 October 2001. File new submission of the development of the concept design for review by the Commission when ready.

S.L. 02-003	2807 Chesterfield Place, NW W. Wahabi Residence	New single-family dwelling Concept.

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed new single-family dwelling as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 10 October 2001. Recommend further study to add an additional off-street automobile parking space. File new submission of working drawings with material samples with permit application, for review by the Commission when ready. (Previous: S.L. 01-006).

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 02-004	F, 2nd and H streets, NE. Station Place.	New office building - Revised concept.

RECOMMENDATION: **ON HOLD for 15 November 2001.** See attached letter to BZA.
(Previous: S.L. 01-081).

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT J-1

31 October 2001

Dear Ms. Kress:

At its meeting on 18 October 2001, the Commission reviewed a revised concept submission for Station Place, a new office building, to be located on 2nd Street, east of Union Station, between F and H Streets (Case number S.L. 02-004). The members approved the concept design for buildings one and two (the southern portion) with the curved entrance atrium and upper floor setback as shown in Scheme 2 in the project book dated and received 11 October 2001. The design for these two buildings was found to be much improved with the reduced height and mid-block setback on 2nd Street. Also included in the concept approval are the below-ground parking levels and vehicular access ramps for the entire project. The design for buildings three and four were not approved as submitted.

As stated in the previous letter, the Commission enthusiastically supports the development of Square 720 (Lots 178 and 179) but recognizes that the streetscape along 2nd Street will be critical to any development's success. Again, members recommended further study to reduce the visual mass of the structure, particularly in regard to the proposal's unusual length. Perhaps by utilizing a different architectural expression for buildings three and four and by physically separating these buildings, above ground, from one and two will furnish much-needed visual relief along this 933-foot long elevation.

The Commission looks forward to the review of the development of the design and is happy to provide the services of its staff should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Jerrily R. Kress, FAIA
Director, Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street, NW, Suite 210 South
Washington, D.C. 20001

cc: George Conril Brown, SEC
Kevin Roche, Roche Dinkeloo & Associates
Wayne Quin, Holland & Knight
Christine Shiker, Holland & Knight
David J. McGettigan, DC Office of Planning
David Maloney, DC Office of Historic Preservation

Smithsonian
Freer Gallery of Art and
Arthur M. Sackler Gallery

EXHIBIT K

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Commission of Fine Arts, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles Lang Freer, have examined the following:

Manuscript page
Imperial Farman of Emperor Akbar
Opaque watercolor, ink, and gold on paper
India
dated 1604
Purchase for the permanent collection
(V22.2001)

END of LIST

18. Oct. 01

For the Commission of Fine Arts ***Date***

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
Freer Gallery of Art
Arthur M. Sackler Gallery
Washington DC 20560-0707